



CITY OF COLLEGE PARK ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
8400 BALTIMORE AVENUE, COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20740
TELEPHONE: (240) 487-3538

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Approved Minutes of Meeting

December 3, 2020

(Due to COVID-19 Pandemic, this was a Virtual Meeting)

<u>Members</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Stephanie Stullich, Chair	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>
Santosh Chelliah, Vice-Chair	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>
Ben Flamm	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>
James McFadden	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>
Daejauna Donahue	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>
Vernae Martin	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>

Also Present: Planning Staff – Terry Schum, Miriam Bader and Theresheia Williams;
Attorney - Susan Cook; Terrapin Main Street Team – Richard Greenberg, Stuart Schooler,
Aaron Schooler, Matthew Tedesco and Joe DiMarco

- I. Call to Order and Amendments to Agenda:** Stephanie Stullich called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.
- II. Approval of the Agenda:** Vernae Martin moved to approve the agenda as published. Santosh Chelliah seconded. Motion carried 6-0-0.
- III. Approval of Minutes:**
Santosh Chelliah moved to adopt the minutes of November 5, 2020, after the correction on page 3, paragraph 5, changing “razed” to “raised.” Vernae Martin seconded. Motion carried 6-0-0.
- IV. Public Remarks on Non-Agenda Items:** There were no Public Remarks on Non-Agenda Items.
- V. Presentation:** Conceptual Site Plan CSP-20002, Terrapin House
A proposal to rezone the property to MUI (Mixed-Use-Infill) to allow for a mixed-use development consisting of 160-175 multifamily units and 10,000-15,000 square feet of commercial/retail space
- Applicant:** Terrapin Main Street, LLC
- Location:** Northeast quadrant of the intersection of Baltimore Avenue and Hartwick Road

Stephanie Stullich informed the attendees of the meeting procedures and how questions or comments could be submitted through the Zoom platform.

Terry Schum gave a brief description of the Terrapin Main Street project. The proposed project is a Conceptual Site Plan application that the City recently received on referral from M-NCPPC. The project involves the redevelopment of the area east of Route One, south of R.J. Bentley's and north of Hartwick Road and west of Yale Avenue. The proposed project requires an assemblage and rezoning which will include the existing Shopping Center, a single-family dwelling behind the shopping center and a small apartment building known as Yale House, all purchased by the owner, Richard Greenberg. The proposed project will be multifamily housing with 175 dwelling units and ground-floor retail. The project is tentatively scheduled for a Planning Board public hearing on January 21, 2021. The City Council will be scheduling their review in advance of the Planning Board hearing.

Ms. Schum introduced the property owner and applicant, Richard Greenberg, and his Land Use Attorney, Matthew Tedesco. Mr. Tedesco introduced the other team members present, Aaron Schooler, Stuart Adams and Joe DiMarco, Civil Engineer.

Mr. Tedesco gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Terrapin House project. He stated that they appreciate the opportunity to work with the City to get more information and feedback from the community. The Conceptual Site Plan application has been accepted. He stated that all the properties have been purchased by the owner. The Yale House is zoned R-18 and the single-family home is R-55 all of which are in the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ). The goal is to rezone the four lots so that it's all one cohesive infill development but there is no proposal for actual redevelopment at this time. One of the reasons for filing the Conceptual Site Plan is to balance out all the properties into a single zone since they are now under one ownership. He stated that the renderings are not necessarily what would be built, the slides of the conceptual site plan are to start a dialogue with the City and community on what parameters and framework to work upon. The Conceptual Site Plan allows them the ability to set parameters so that when they do move forward with the Preliminary Plan and Detailed Site Plan, they would have conceptually laid out some flexibility to accommodate a development that everyone can be proud of and have an interest in.

Stephanie Stullich, Chair, thanked Mr. Tedesco for his presentation and asked APC Members and the audience if there were any questions. In addition to APC members and staff, there were 5 members of the Applicant's team and 23 members of the public attending the meeting. The questions and answers and comments are summarized below.

1. **Question from Stephanie Stullich:** Do you have an approximate timeline for the project?

Answer by Matthew Tedesco: There is no definite date yet. Even after the Conceptual Site Plan is approved, there will still be about another year for other entitlements and applying for the permits.

2. **Question from Vernae Martin:** Do the PowerPoint renderings show underground parking for residential and commercial?

Answer by Richard Greenberg: Yes, the renderings show parking for residential and commercial.

3. **Question by Vernae Martin:** Are the residential units all rental and what size will they be?

Answer by Stuart Schooler: The units will all be rentals. The size of the units will be dictated by market demand.

4. **Question from Vernae Martin:** Has there been any thought to having designated affordable housing units within the residential portion of the development?

Answer by Stuart Schooler: The actual breakdown has not been discussed at this time.

5. **Question by Santosh Chelliah:** What will the height of the building be?

Answer by Matthew Tedesco: We will adhere to the maximum height of the Development District Standards, which is six stories, so it would not be higher than that.

6. **Question by Santosh Chelliah:** What percentage of the existing retail will be retained?

Answer by Stuart Schooler: It is too far in advance to answer that because we don't know how many tenants are planning to stay, but we are not planning to ask any of the tenants to leave.

7. **Question by Stephanie Stullich:** How long will businesses be inoperable during construction?

Answer by Stuart Schooler: For a building of this size, construction from demolition to groundbreaking would take around 18 months.

8. **Question from Stephanie Stullich:** Do you know how much time is left on the leases?

Answer by Richard Greenberg: They are all over the board with all different timeframes.

9. **Question from Terry Schum:** Can someone discuss the proposed vehicular access to the property?

Answer by Richard Greenberg: The main vehicular entry point into the garage would probably be from Yale Avenue and the pedestrian access would be Route 1 and/or Hartwick Road.

10. **Question from Michelle Taylor-Bible:** I purchased my home two years ago at Hartwick Road and Calvert Road. I love living in historic College Park and a college town. With all the tall buildings being built, it is starting to make the City look dark and claustrophobic. I am concerned about the deliveries to retail spaces in College Park and would like to know how deliveries will be addressed in the area of the proposed development? I love walking through the neighborhoods. There is no character and no one is taking pride in the history of the City. The developer should embrace College Park and include some character in his project.

Answer by Richard Greenberg: We have not decided on one particular user group that would be the end-user of this building. We are early in the process and market research has not been conducted. Currently, there is no loading dock for the retail as it exists today, so as for deliveries, loading and unloading for future retail, I don't see any negative changes. As we get more detailed and start looking at garages, traffic circulation, etc., we will do everything we can to explore all options available.

11. **Question from Robert Schnabel:** I am extremely disappointed in all the recent buildings that have been going up in College Park directly next to the Old Town Historic District. This has been an assault on the local historic district. These buildings that occupy an entire block are totally out of scale with what should be there. I suggest that the design be changed with regard to use because we are inundated with student housing. I recommend that this project not be allowed to go forward because I think many problems are going to be associated with it. The recent flooding problem on Knox Road was a truant waterway, and this is occurring frequently. Our property was flooded recently and we were pumping water out of our basement. Climate change is going to bring about an incredible amount of more rainfall and flooding. We need a huge improvement in dealing with runoff problems.

Answer by Matthew Tedesco: A lot of the things Mr. Schnabel commented on are things that can be worked on when we get to the point of design and the Detailed Site Plan. Some of the items referenced can be incorporated into the design as we move forward.

12. **Question from Jason Azevedo:** At this stage of the design conceptual phase, is it inclusive of any analysis about flooding and what the impact would be of introducing so much impermeability to that site? There are already increasing flooding issues within the Calvert Hills and Hartwick Road areas that experience pretty quick flooding in normal storm events. Introducing more impermeability could exacerbate that which has been of increasing concern with more and more development happening. Has there been any discussion on what your thoughts are about stormwater management to not exacerbate the flooding issue? I would encourage the developer to take on a much more conservative track than what the code may require.

Answer by Matthew Tedesco: Because this is a Conceptual Site Plan, the Department of Permitting Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) does not require a stormwater concept plan because, at this stage, no development can occur. With the Preliminary Plan and Detailed Site Plan, we are required to get approved by DPIE before the application is accepted. When we are at the stormwater concept plan phase DPIE will require a 100-year attenuation for the 100-year storm on this development. Prince Georges County and the State of Maryland are quite extensive - when it comes to stormwater management, it's one of the most restrictive and requires retention for quality and quantity control. The Yale House and the single-family house have no stormwater systems, so with the redevelopment, we would actually be improving the current situation because most of these properties that are under redevelopment have no stormwater controls. Having redevelopment does promote a better situation and improvement to what's there on infill redevelopment sites.

13. **Question from Stephanie Stullich:** If Prince George's is so robust, why is the problem getting worse? There is more development and the flooding problems in this area of College Park have gotten worse over the past 10 years. I think we have had three 100-year storms in the past 10 years.

Answer from Matthew Tedesco: Each of these new sites that take an existing 100 percent impervious area that has no stormwater quality control and introduces a redevelopment project that holds back, attenuates, and discharges those events at a controlled rate, is an improvement. There are a lot of upstream issues. In our estimation, each of these projects does contribute a small part by not making it worst and by actually improving water control on these sites that don't currently have any.

Answer from Joe DiMarco, Civil Engineer: Prince George's County requires 100-year retention and attenuation on-site for flood management purposes. The proposed development adds a building that covers the better portion of the site and in doing so introduces impervious surface. We would then collect the drainage that hits the rooftop of that surface as well as other areas on the site and actually bring it to an underground retention vault system or large pipe system which would hold it back and slowly release that so that we're not exacerbating any of the flooding conditions which are well known for the downtown area.

Answer from Stuart Schooler: The retail building is almost 100% impervious and the existing apartment building is almost 100% impervious. The 100-year storm has not been occurring 1% of the time if you look at the past 10 years. We will have to look at more mitigation attenuation like green roofs on the roof for this building because the pervious surface, almost everything else is paved. We will have to look at some underground retention measures.

14. **Question from Jeanne Jennings:** I have lived in College Park for 37 years and have suffered through several flooding issues during the last 10 years. I also agree that the architecture should be something rather distinctive that would be in line with College Park's architecture. Also, to have the family-owned businesses on Route One have to evacuate during construction and return seems difficult. It would be nice if the City could offer some kind of economic or relocation assistance to the family-owned businesses during the relocation process.

Answer by Richard Greenberg: I can't dictate what the market is going to look like in the next two to four years. We will do what we can to keep businesses that desire to remain in place. It is no different than what we are doing today with businesses that are struggling to remain open through the pandemic. I will pledge now that we will continue to do our best and keep everybody afloat and prospering and in business.

15. **Question from Eric Sussman (chat):** What can we expect in terms of traffic study and mitigation? Traffic on and around Baltimore Avenue and this area can be a nuisance. An example is the backups that form eastbound on Knox Road at Baltimore Avenue. Will you be able to work with authorities to examine traffic and advocate for improvements where possible? For example, upgraded technology that improves timing. It is also worth noting that there is a severe lack of loading zones for the current businesses on Baltimore Avenue. There is an increased need for loading zones due to the use of rideshare and delivery services. Can we expect that building residents will be eligible for street parking permits?

Answer by Matthew Tedesco: Traffic impact analysis is required at the time of subdivision which would be the next step in the process after the conceptual site plan. In addition, the sector plan requires a traffic analysis to be done at the time of the detailed site plan.

Answer by Terry Schum: Loading is required to be provided as part of the project so it needs to be shown on a plan. Because this is a conceptual site plan, we haven't seen those details yet, but I assume that at least one loading zone would need to be incorporated into the project and that might be within the building itself. As far as residential parking permits, it would be highly unusual for the City Council to allow residents of a project like this to obtain on-street parking permits. Parking is expected to be provided for the residents within the building itself.

Answer by Stephanie Stulich: Generally, that has been the case with other large developments. They've been required to provide parking for their residents and to the extent, they generally don't provide sufficient parking for all of the residents. The residents may not need parking to be provided if they are for example walking to the University for school or work but in any case that is expected to not have a parking impact on the neighborhood. The neighborhood does have permit parking precisely because of these kinds of concerns.

Answer by Terry Schum: The State Highway Administration (SHA) controls the signal timing for all the intersections in College Park. If changes are made at one intersection it usually prompts changes to others. Sometimes those changes are successful and sometimes they're not. The intersection of Hardwick Road and Baltimore Avenue will be upgraded fairly soon as a result of another development project taking place on the west side of Route 1. It will be upgraded to a full signalized intersection. Right now, it's only a pedestrian-activated red light that stops vehicles along Baltimore Avenue. The upgrade is definitely coming soon to that intersection but I can't speak to a corridor-wide signal timing study.

16. **Question from Dan Oates (chat):** Have the developers considered pursuing owner-occupied units, for example, condominiums rather than rental units or some mix for this project? We have already seen a huge number of new apartment buildings built or under construction in College Park recently. It would be positive to have more owner-occupied housing available that is more acceptable in the community.

Answer by Richard Greenberg: The market report has not been done. We don't know what this end product is going to be. We do believe it's going to be a mixed-use project but whether it will be renter, buyer student, or graduate we just can't answer that question today.

17. **Question from Don Jennings:** In the slide for the concept of the building, what do the white blocks represent? Are they just placeholders?

Answer from Matthew Tedesco: The white blocks indicate where there is approved or ongoing redevelopment.

Comments

1. **John Payne (chat):** Thank you for the presentation I like the general concept of residential over retail I think that is what downtown College Park needs. I would like for the developers to do everything they can to preserve space for Toms and Northwest Chinese and other local non-chain businesses. I have a strong preference against by-the-bed student housing. I personally think the proposed scale is appropriate with step down for the residential area.
2. **Stu Adams:** I definitely agree with preserving the locally-owned small businesses that are currently here. I really want to emphasize owner-occupancy we're seeing thousands upon thousands of rental units coming online in this area with very few owner-occupancy potentials. I suggest relocating the small home to another location. It shows the character of College Park and the historical nature of the neighborhood.

3. **Anahi Espindola:** By allowing all these new developments, the local population is less trustful of the decision-makers. Every time there is a new project, they are introduced to the residents as attractive until they are built. The residents start believing that financial gain is more important than keeping the residents happy. It seems that they are trying to make all of Downtown College Park just a series of blocks. There is a negative feedback from the community, but the project is developed anyway. There has to be a very honest discussion for the general plan of what we want for the City.
4. **Madeline Zilfi:** I have lived in College Park almost all my life - my family has had six generations live in College Park. I really feel that we have started down a path where we are taking away the quaint college town that we had envisioned that has been here for more than 100 years. I love that house on the corner every time I drive by it I just enjoy looking at it I don't care if a single-family lives there or a few kids live there it is representative of College Park. It's like a Canyon driving down route one. We are losing the soul of College Park. I feel like my father and all the other ancestors would just roll over in their graves. It used to be that the civic associations and the College Park council had some weight but now they are just rolling over and doing whatever somebody wants.

VI. Update on Development Activity Terry Schum reported on the following:

Aspen Maryland – This student housing project is proposed at the intersection of Guilford Drive and Knox Road. There are three existing buildings on either side of the street. The north and southside of Knox Road have been assembled by one property owner, an out of town developer of student housing. They are proposing 9-story buildings on each side of the road. that would also have a small amount of ground-floor retail. The developer will present the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision application to the City Council on December 8th and that will be followed up with a Detailed Site Plan application later in the month. In the Preliminary Plan, they have to address the floodplain on the property. There is also a stormwater management concept plan that has to be figured out at this stage and any right-of-way or easement issues are typically addressed at this time.

VII. Other Business: There was no Other Business.

VIII. Adjourn: There being no further business, Ben Flamm moved to adjourn the meeting. James McFadden seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.